Rebuttal Volume 37/1

3rd October 2014

THE HIGHWAYS ACT 1980
-and-
THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE HIGHWAYS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 1994
COMPULSORY PURCHASE (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 2007

REFERENCE: LAO/NW/SRO/2013/40 and LAO/NW/CPO/2013/41

REBUTTAL PROOF

-of-

James McMahon in relation to the Proof

of

Dr Sarah Riley

on behalf of

The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport

acting on its behalf and on behalf of

-Manchester City Council -and-

Cheshire East Borough Council

to be presented to a Local Public Inquiry on the 30th September 2014 to consider objections to

THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF STOCKPORT (HAZEL GROVE (A6) TO MANCHESTER AIRPORT A555 CLASSIFIED ROAD) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2013

THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF STOCKPORT (HAZEL GROVE (A6) TO MANCHESTER AIRPORT A555 CLASSIFIED ROAD) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2013

Parveen Akhtar
Head of Legal and Democratic Governance
The Metropolitan Borough Council of Stockport
Corporate and Support Services
Town Hall, Stockport SK1 3XE

This rebuttal proof of evidence sets out the Council's response to the objector's proof in relation to their objection to the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Compulsory Purchase Order and/ or Side Road Order that was submitted to the Department for Transport by Dr Sarah Riley.

This rebuttal proof is presented by the Council's Project Director for the A6MARR scheme. James McMahon, however, contributions to this rebuttal have been made by the Council's Expert Witnesses as indicated alongside the responses.

The Expert Witnesses contributing to the responses to the objections submitted are as follows:

Expert Witness	Initials	Proof of Evidence Name and Reference Number
James McMahon	JMcM	Volume 1
Naz Huda	NH	Volume 2
Nasar Malik	NM	Volume 3
Paul Reid	PR	Volume 4
Paul Colclough	PC	Volume 5
Jamie Bardot	JB	Volume 6
Alan Houghton	AH	Volume 7
Sue Stevenson	SS	Volume 8
James McMahon	JMcM	Volume 9
Henry Church	HC	Volume 10

Objector 60: Dr Sarah Riley			
Element of objector proof	**Objection**	**Response**	**Expert Witness**
60/R01	The primary concern, which has also been highlighted by Stockport Council, is that the volume of traffic on this lane will significantly increase both during the construction process and subsequently once the bypass is functional. 1. **Traffic Volume** - currently, if there is a traffic jam on the A6, just a small increase in the traffic on the lane presents problems, due to the speed with which 'rat runners' travel and the narrow width of road in several areas (single carriageway and insufficient passing places) 2. **Traffic Speed** - people do not adhere to the 30 mph presently in force. I do not see how a 20 mph will be of any use! There are often people on the straight areas driving up to 70 mph. 3. **Types of vehicles** - see point 5 re resident commercial traffic. Often, as the lane is not wide enough, the larger vehicles drive on the verge, causing the destruction of the dykes which leads to poor drainage with the water collecting on the road creating very dangerous black ice patches, or actual water-damage to the road surface (towards the A6 end of the lane). 4. **Suitability of the road** - it is a single carriageway in the majority of places. There are some hairpin bends which people take too fast. The	Appropriate traffic management measures will be implemented on Threaphurst Lane and Torkington Road as part of the proposed package of traffic mitigation measures. The 'Quiet Lane' concept will be introduced on these roads and this is as described within paragraphs 9.22 and 9.23 of the Transport Assessment submitted as part of the planning application. The proposed mitigation measures package mitigation measures packages also include the junction improvements proposed at A6/Windlehurst Road, High Lane. The predicted forecast of traffic flows with the implementation of the enhanced mitigation measures package is shown on Figure 9.6 of the Transport Assessment. The forecast Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow figures indicate that there will be decrease with the implementation of the enhanced mitigation measures with the proposed scheme in comparison to the scenario of no scheme in place for 2017	JMcM / NM

foundation of the road is already under strain with the present traffic weight/volume as can be seen by the undulating areas, cracking tarmac on the central and edges sections, areas of collapse into the dykes, large and deep potholes, kerb stones being driven over and pushed into the dykes, blocking them and subsequent drainage problems.

5. Other road users:

- **RESIDENT commercial traffic**

- Farm traffic - tractors with/without balers/spreaders, animal transport etc

- HGV - Wagons

- Skip Trucks (based on Torkington road)

- HGV - Low loaders

- Bin trucks (not resident)

ALL of the above take up the entire width of the road and although there are a few passing places, these are not suitable for more than 1 car to pass at a time.

- **CHILDREN**: there are 6 young children resident on the lane and more that visit family. Some cars pass at 60mph + and this is a MORTALITY WAITING TO HAPPEN.

- **HORSES:** There are stables on the lane as well as residents who own horses. Combined with the use of the lane to get to Middlewood Way by the two riding schools based on Torkington Road and Wellington Road (A6), there is daily horse traffic which is not suitable

(predicted year of opening). This is as shown below:

	Threaphurst Lane	Torkington Road
2009 Base Year	500	1500
2017 without Relief Road	600	2500
2017 with Relief Road (enhanced mitigation)	100	2000

	in combination with a large volume of traffic on the lane, due to the width of the lane and the speed with which people drive. - **FARM ANIMALS:** crossing - **DOG WALKERS**: many use this lane due to its connections with Middlewood Way - **CYCLISTS**: used regularly by many cyclists and dangerous re the speed with which people cut through A few suggestions have been made by the residents: (although these are limited due to the commercial traffic i.e. re width restrictions etc) 1. ACCESS ONLY - road - and for this to be properly enforced 2. SPEED HUMPS - although these are not always viable where farm traffic is concerned		